



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,880	04/17/2004	Fuhwei Lwo	BEA920030033US1	8613
49474 7590 06/02/2008 LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL DRYJA 1474 N COOPER RD #105-248 GILBERT, AZ 85233				
EXAMINER				
TRUVAN, LEYNN A THANH				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2135				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/02/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/825,880

Applicant(s)

LWO, FUHWEI

Examiner

Leynna T. Truvan

Art Unit

2135

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 16 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12, 17, 19 and 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) 8-11 and 13-15 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 16, and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11,13-16 and 18 are pending.
Claims 12, 17, and 19-20 are cancelled by applicant.
2. The rejection of claims 1-11,13-16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 101 are withdrawn.
3. Claims 8-11 and 13-15 are allowable over art.
4. Claims 1-7, 16, and 18 remains rejected over Peart and Stoneking.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-7, 16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peart, et al. (US 7,330,872), and further in view of Stoneking, et al. (US 5,982,390).

As per claim 1:

Peart discloses a system comprising:

hardware, including one or more of memory, processors, and storage devices;

(col.5, lines 1-10)

a plurality of inter-related first objects *[that share a predetermined password]*, the inter-related first objects implemented via the hardware, the inter-related first objects being greater than two in number; and, (col.17, lines 50-50)

a plurality of first object-oriented interfaces defining methods supported by the inter-related first objects, the first object-oriented interfaces publicly made available by the inter-related first objects and queryable by second objects and the inter-related first objects to learn of the first object-oriented interfaces; (col.18, lines 5-45)

each first object-oriented interface including a password argument to limit access thereto to the inter-related first objects *[sharing the predetermined password]*, such that the first object-oriented interfaces are queryable by the second objects but the methods defined by the first object-oriented interfaces are uninvokable by the second objects due to the second objects not sharing the predetermined password. (col.8, lines 1-11 and col.17, lines 25-35)

Examiner gives the broadest and reasonable interpretation for uninvokable as something that is unavailable or unauthenticated thus limiting access or not having the same credentials as the objects deemed to be authenticated.

Peart discloses group of objects and object classes that can query the object for application information (col.17, lines 50-63 and col.18, lines 6-35). Thus, Peart suggests the claimed inter-related first objects and second objects where the inter-related first objects being greater than two in number. Peart discusses various authentication mechanisms, i.e. password, token-base, etc., for authenticating the objects (col.18, lines 12-15). In addition, Peart discloses when an unauthorized

applications are not filtered from the display, a notice can be provided indicating that such applications are unavailable. This obviously suggests it is uninvokable if there lacks password or authentication method being deemed unauthorized. Although, Peart discloses the object-oriented interface includes a password argument to limit access for the first objects and lack of password argument for some other (second) objects. However, did not further explain that is required by a predetermined specification so that the means satisfies a standard governed by the predetermined specification.

Stoneking teaches a method and system for encapsulating the personality traits and behaviors of characters into digital objects where objects defined are referred as personality objects (col.1, lines 43-52). Stoneking discloses controller object generates a secret transaction session key, encrypts it and sends it to the personality object. The secret key, serves as a secret password shared only by the personality object and the controller object for the current interaction session where the key is saved by both objects for later use in authenticating transactions and ensuring message integrity (col.11, lines 29-57). Stoneking discusses an authentication stamp to all brokered transactions between two or more personality objects which suggests the claimed inter-related first objects being greater than two in number. Stoneking further discusses marking the objects unauthenticated where they need not compute an authentication stamp for outgoing messages since it will be ignored, thus reduces computational costs (col.13, lines 35-40). Stoneking also includes password shared between objects for authenticated objects and the unauthenticated key for the unauthenticated objects (col.13, lines 34-52). Hence, Stoneking suggests the unauthenticated objects as the

second objects different from the shared password of the authenticated first objects. This obviously lacks authentication or password argument which suggests the (first) objects that shares a predetermined password are uninvokable by the unauthenticated ones objects (col.10, lines 32-55 and col.11, lines 58-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine Peart with Stoneking to teach required by a predetermined specification so that the means satisfies a standard governed by the predetermined specification because the objects uses the shared predetermined password in authenticating transactions and ensuring message integrity that are uninvokable by the unauthenticated second objects (Stoneking – col.11, lines 38-40 and 52-61).

As per claim 2: See Peart on col.18, lines 5-55 and Stoneking on col.14, lines 3-14; discussing the system of claim 1, further comprising a plurality of second object-oriented interfaces defining methods supported by the inter-related first objects, the second object-oriented interfaces publicly made available by the inter-related first objects and queryable by the second objects and the inter-related first objects to learn of the second object-oriented interfaces.

As per claim 3: See Peart on col.8, lines 1-11 and Stoneking on col.13, lines 41-52 and col.11, lines 58-62; discussing the system of claim 2, wherein the second object-oriented interfaces are required by a predetermined specification so that the inter-related first objects are objects that satisfy a standard governed by the predetermined specification, and lack password arguments to limit access thereto, the methods defined by the plurality of second object-oriented interfaces returning a type of "not

implemented" message in response to invocation thereof.

As per claim 4: See Peart on col.8, lines 1-11 and Stoneking on col.13, lines 41-52; discussing the system of claim 3, wherein the second object-oriented interfaces correspond to the first object-oriented interfaces, such that each second object-oriented interface is a non-implemented and password-free version of one of the first object-oriented interfaces.

As per claim 5: See Peart on col.18, lines 5-55 and col.6, lines 41-67; discussing the system of claim 1, further comprising an object manager to manage the plurality of inter-related first objects and the second objects, the object manager responsive to requests from the inter-related first objects and the second objects to invoke the methods defined by the first object-oriented interfaces, and responsive to queries from the inter-related first objects and the second objects about the first object-oriented interfaces.

As per claim 6: See Peart on col.17, lines 35-67 and Stoneking on col.7, lines 1-4; discussing the system of claim 5, wherein the second objects at least partially represent one or more client applications running on the system.

As per claim 7: See Peart on col.18, lines 5-55 and Stoneking on col.14, lines 2-22; discussing the system of claim 6, wherein each inter-related first object represents a proxy between the object manager and system resources and acts as a client when invoking those of the methods supported by other of the inter-related first objects.

As per claim 16:

Peart discloses an article of manufacture comprising:

a tangible computer-readable medium, the medium being a recordable data storage medium; and, (col.5, lines 1-10)

means in the medium for implementing a first object-oriented interface and a second object-oriented interface both defining a method, the first object-oriented interface including a password argument to limit access thereto to inter-related objects, the second object-oriented interface lacking a password argument to limit access thereto, (col.7, lines 15-67 and col.17, lines 25-35)

wherein the means is further for returning a type of "not implemented" message in response to invocation of the method of the second object-oriented interface. (col.8, lines 1-11)

wherein the second object-oriented interface corresponds to the first object-oriented interface [and is required by a predetermined specification so that the means satisfies a standard governed by the predetermined specification], and (col.18, lines 5-55)

wherein the second object-oriented interface is identical to the first object-oriented interface except that the second object-oriented interface is non-implemented and password-free. (col.18, lines 1-11 and 26-35)

Examiner gives the broadest and reasonable interpretation for uninvokable as something that is unavailable or unauthenticated thus limiting access or not having the same credentials as the objects deemed to be authenticated.

Peart discloses group of objects and object classes that can query the object for application information (col.17, lines 50-63 and col.18, lines 6-35). Thus, Peart suggests the claimed inter-related first objects and second objects where the inter-related first objects being greater than two in number. Peart discusses various authentication mechanisms, i.e. password, token-base, etc., for authenticating the objects (col.18, lines 12-15). In addition, Peart discloses when an unauthorized applications are not filtered from the display, a notice can be provided indicating that such applications are unavailable. This obviously suggests it is uninvokable if there lacks password or authentication method being deemed unauthorized. Although, Peart discloses the object-oriented interface includes a password argument to limit access for the first objects and lack of password argument for some other (second) objects. However, did not further explain that is required by a predetermined specification so that the means satisfies a standard governed by the predetermined specification.

Stoneking teaches a method and system for encapsulating the personality traits and behaviors of characters into digital objects where objects defined are referred as personality objects (col.1, lines 43-52). Stoneking discloses controller object generates a secret transaction session key, encrypts it and sends it to the personality object. The secret key, serves as a secret password shared only by the personality object and the controller object for the current interaction session where the key is saved by both objects for later use in authenticating transactions and ensuring message integrity (col.11, lines 29-57). Stoneking discusses an authentication stamp to all brokered transactions between two or more personality objects which suggests the claimed inter-

related first objects being greater than two in number (col.12, lines 31-35). Stoneking further discusses marking the objects unauthenticated where they need not compute an authentication stamp for outgoing messages since it will be ignored, thus reduces computational costs (col.13, lines 35-40). Stoneking also includes password shared between objects for authenticated objects and the unauthenticated key for the unauthenticated objects (col.13, lines 34-52). Hence, Stoneking suggests the unauthenticated objects as the second objects different from the shared password of the authenticated first objects. This obviously lacks authentication or password argument which suggests the (first) objects that shares a predetermined password are uninvokable by the unauthenticated ones objects (col.10, lines 32-55 and col.11, lines 58-62).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skills in the art to combine Peart with Stoneking to teach required by a predetermined specification so that the means satisfies a standard governed by the predetermined specification because the objects uses the shared predetermined password in authenticating transactions and ensuring message integrity that are uninvokable by the unauthenticated second objects (Stoneking – col.11, lines 38-40 and 52-61).

As per claim 18: See Peart on col.18, lines 5-55 and Stoneking on col.14, lines 3-14; discussing the article of claim 16, wherein the means is further for returning the first and the second object-oriented interfaces in response to queries therefor.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 16, and 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claims 8-11 and 13-15 are allowable over art. Thus, arguments regarding these claims are moot.

Claims 1-7, 16, and 18 are now rejected over the Peart and Stoneking combination. Thus, arguments regarding prior art Kishimoto are moot and will not address the arguments of the dependent claims. However, Stoneking remains as the secondary prior art, so independent claim 1 will only be addressed below. For, all dependent claims are also rejected by virtue of their dependencies.

Regarding the argument on pg.12, that Stoneking does not share passwords between more than two objects. Stoneking discusses an authentication stamp to all brokered transactions between two or more personality objects which suggests the claimed inter-related first objects being greater than two in number (Stoneking – col.12, lines 31-35). Innuendo, Peart discloses this limitation (Peart - col.17, lines 50-63 and col.18, lines 6-35) and Stoneking is combined to teach that it is obvious for the objects to use the shared predetermined password in authenticating transactions and ensuring message integrity that are uninvokable by the unauthenticated second objects (Stoneking – col.11, lines 38-40 and 52-61).

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leynna T. Truvan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3851. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (7:00 - 5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. T. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 2135

***/KIMYEN VU/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2135***